

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hernandez for granting and conducting a telephone interview on November 9, 2010.

During the interview the Applicants' representative discussed various potential claim amendments and whether or not said amendments overcame the prior art rejections.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Based on the results of the interview, independent claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0019], [0052]-[0054], [0058], [0059], [0065], [0067], [0070] and [0076] of the publication of the present application (i.e., U.S. 2004/0187165).

It is also noted that claims 2, 16 and 18 have been amended to make editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims 2 16 and 18 in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, this amendment should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Waki (EP 1056290). Further, claims 2-6, 9-14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba (U.S. 6,714,660), Kawakami (U.S. 2002/0012522) and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an integrated circuit including a bus, a first memory connected to the bus, a first processing unit that accesses the first memory via the bus, a second processing unit, and a second memory that is accessed by the second processing unit without passing through the bus, such that the second processing unit accesses the second memory without accessing the bus. Further, claim 1 recites that the second memory is occupied by the second processing unit, such that the second processing unit stores image data (related to at least one of output image data and video signals) in the second memory.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection (i) equates the de-multiplexer 303 and the decoder 306 of Waki with the claimed second processing unit, (ii) equates the high-speed memory 307 of Waki with the claimed second memory, and (iii) equates the memory unit 310 and the storage unit 312 with the claimed first memory, as recited in previously presented claim 1. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the second memory and the second processing unit, it is submitted that Waki fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the second memory and the second processing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Waki teaches that the high speed memory 307 (equated with the claimed second memory) is accessible by both the decoder 306 (equated with the claimed second processing unit) and the bus 314, and teaches that the de-multiplexer 303 and the decoder 306 directly store image data on both the high speed memory 307 and the memory unit 310 and/or the storage unit 312 (both 310 and 312 were equated with the claimed first memory) (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0091]).

Thus, in view of the above, because Waki teaches that the de-multiplexer 303 and the decoder 306 store image data on both the high speed memory 307 and the memory unit 310 and/or the storage unit 312, Waki cannot be said to disclose or suggest that the second memory is occupied by the second processing unit, such that the second processing unit stores image data (related to at least one of output image data and video signals) in the second memory, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 7 and 15 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Waki.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba, Kawakami and the AAPA (additional references), it is respectfully submitted that these additional references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Waki reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Waki with any of the additional references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Waki, Ohba, Kawakami and/or the AAPA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill

in the art to modify Waki, Kawakami and/or the AAPA to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 8 and 12 are directed to an electric device and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 12 and claims 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji KAI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.12.06 11:32:26 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 6, 2010